



Next Steps

Using Insights from the Residentially Based Services Project to Inform California's Statewide Continuum of Care Reform Implementation Efforts

Webinar Agenda

- **Welcome:** Introduction & opening comments from partners
- **Background:** a quick history of RBS and CCR
- **Comparison:** Looking at the links between the core program elements of RBS and CCR
- **Insights:** Some lessons learned from RBS that may assist the CCR implementation at the state, local and provider levels
- **Evaluation:** What is RBS accomplishing? Preliminary results from the Year Three evaluation
- **Connections:** Ways in which insights gained through the RBS process are being expressed in the values underlying the CCR effort
- **Discussion:** A chance to share your ideas
- **Conclusion:** Sources for more information.

Welcome

- Housekeeping
- Opening comments:
 - California Department of Social Services
 - Casey Family Programs
 - California Alliance of Child & Family Services
- Introduction of our first speaker

Background

- RBS beginnings and evolution 2006 - 2013
 - Vision: Increase permanency, safety and well-being for children and youth by transforming the nature of group care in California
 - Focus: Discovering the program elements that drive positive outcomes
- CCR beginnings and evolution
 - Vision: All children live with a committed, permanent and nurturing family
 - Focus: Building a consistent and effective continuum of care across the range of services, including but going beyond those included in RBS

CCR's Broader Scope

DRAFT CCR MODEL

California Statewide Practice Model

CCR Vision: All children live with a committed, permanent and nurturing family.

Services and supports are tailored to meet the needs of the individual child and family being served with the ultimate goal of maintaining the family or when this isn't possible, transitioning the child or youth to a permanent family and/or preparing the youth for a successful transition into adulthood.

When needed, group home care is a short-term, specialized and intensive intervention that is just one part of a continuum of care available for children, youth and young adults.

Child & Family Team

Assessment

- Individualized
- Child & Family Strengths & Needs
- Safety issues
- Services & Support

Placement Selection

- Provider Performance Data
- Child Safety Needs
- Other Placement considerations

Resource Families

- Foster Family Homes (Related & Non Related Caregivers)
- SCI Available
- County Approved

FFAs

- Therapeutic Foster Care & Non-Therapeutic Foster Care
- Core Services Available
- Mental Health Services
- Additional Services:
 - Relative caregiver support
 - Short – Term Assessment & Transition (Shelter)

Group Homes

- 7 Core Services Available
- Individualized Service Package & Rate
- Mental Health Services
- Specified Staffing Qualification
- Accredited

Publicly Available Performance Data

RBS touches multiple parts of CCR model

Comparison of Program Elements

CCR Group Home Elements	RBS
Child and Family Team	Comprehensive Coordination; Continuity of Care
Intensive Treatment	Intensive Treatment
Community Services and Supports	Parallel Community Care
Establishing Permanent Connections	Intensive Family Involvement
Transitions	Follow-along Aftercare
Group Care → Short-term	Shortened Length of Stay
Education Support	
Health Care Support	

Building on Success and Struggles

- RBS presents a useful example of what it takes to get a large scale change effort off the ground and moving
- RBS is a learning lab for generating insights that can be applied in the CCR process
- The following slides provide a brief overview of some of those insights:
 - From a general project implementation perspective
 - From the state, county and provider perspectives
 - From a resource access and allocation perspective

Project Implementation

- Getting the RBS project up and running presented a wide range of challenges, including:
 - Insuring full, active and effective family participation in the process
 - Designing the models
 - Funding the models
 - Establishing the programs
 - Regulating and evaluating the programs
- Solving problems linearly didn't work—we had to use spiral planning because changes in one element usually produced or required alteration in the others

State Level Insights

- Developing an integrated vision for large scale system re-design to support family-centered operation and impact
 - Understanding the connections between the moving pieces
 - Looking for changes that would make a difference for families
- Leading long-term change to support vision:
 - Fully committed change champions
 - Shifting from competition to collaboration
- Nurturing pragmatic innovation by supporting an inclusive community of practice

County Level Insights

- Identifying the population of children & families best served by RBS
 - Designing from children and families up
 - Matching resources with needs
 - Incorporating a broader understanding of permanency
- Aligning the program with other county change initiatives
- Establishing protocols for using the program
- Helping staff understand, accept and use the new approach

Provider Level Insights

- Recognizing the impact of opening agency doors to full family inclusion
- Finding ways for staff to provide continuity of care from the facility to the community
- Developing strategies to accomplish shortened stays in the group care component:
 - For youth who had already been in care long periods of time and were acclimated to institutional care
 - For newly entering youth in the midst of behavioral disruption
- Identifying, training, and supporting staff to implement family-centered practice
- Creating new information, billing and personnel management systems to support the program's operation

Resource Challenges

- Money – the root of all frustration
 - Drilling down on actual costs of care
 - Fitting multiple funding streams together
 - Creating fiscal models that make sense for providers and payers
 - Defining, measuring and incentivizing progress
 - Setting rates that incorporate continuity of care across environments
- Finding family care providers
 - Family foster homes
 - Finding, engaging and supporting extended family resources

Evaluation: What is RBS accomplishing?

Preliminary results from Year Three Evaluation**

- RBS performance measures
- Preliminary results of the year three evaluation
- Qualitative evaluation results (See journal article.)
- Comparison of RBS and CCR evaluation criteria should be a topic for discussion today, or more likely, in the future

**Special thanks to WRMA and the RBS Evaluation Subcommittee for building these slides.

RBS Performance Measures

Uses data collection procedures and instruments already being administered by all (or most) participating demonstration sites:

- ***Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS)***
- ***Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths Assessment - Child Welfare version (CANS-CW)***
- ***Youth Services Survey for Youth (YSS)***
- ***Youth Services Survey for Families (YSS-F)***

Over Half of Youth Served by RBS Participated in the Evaluation

Over 350 youth have been served in RBS since inception of the program. 188 youth and their parents agreed to be in the RBS evaluation.

RBS Site	Reported Receiving Services	Initial CANS	Exit CANS
Los Angeles	215 ¹	82	44
Sacramento	55	41	20
San Bernardino	40 ²	28	19
San Francisco	49	37	10
Total	359¹	188	93

¹This number is approximate.

²In San Bernardino County two additional youth re-enrolled.

RBS Performance Measures

RBS Outcome	Mandated by AB 1453 or Stakeholder Request
CHILDREN	
Achievement of permanency	AB 1453
Length of stay in group care	AB 1453
Re-entry into group care and foster care	AB 1453
Analyses of the involvement of children and their families in services planning and treatment	AB 1453
Client satisfaction	AB 1453
Child safety	Stakeholder Request
Child well-being	Stakeholder Request
Child educational progress	Stakeholder Request
Child and family voice and choice	Stakeholder Request
The existence of a connection with a caring adult	Stakeholder Request

Limitations of Evaluation

1. Data available for only a portion of RBS clients. So in some sites, a very modest number of youth are included.
2. Date of initial CANS varies compared with initial date of receiving RBS services
3. Some sites are not collecting data for all dimensions of the CANS.
4. Differences between versions of the CANS but work done with John Lyons enabled us to combine responses from four sites.

Preliminary Findings: CANS-CW¹ All-County Aggregate

	Baseline for Youth Who Exited (n = 93)	Exit Assessment (n = 93)	Indication of Improvement ²
Functional Status	3.8 (5.6) ³	2.5 (3.5)	Yes**
Mental Health	13.0 (5.6)	10.2 (5.1)	Yes***
Risk Behaviors	6.9 (4.4)	5.6 (4.3)	Yes*
Substance Use Complications	2.2 (5.1)	3.6 (6.6)	Negative Trend
Family/Caregiver Needs and Strengths	11.2 (8.7)	7.5 (7.4)	Yes***
Child Strengths	15.6 (4.4)	13.0 (5.5)	Yes***
Child Safety	6.0 (7.0)	3.8 (6.4)	Yes**
Educational Progress	11.2 (8.0)	10.2 (8.4)	No
Relationship Permanence	1.5 (0.8)	1.3 (0.8)	Yes**

¹Scores range from 0 to 30. Relationship permanence scores range from 1 to 3. Lower score equates to lower level of need or greater strength.

²This column refers to ranges of p-values for repeated measures analyses of the change from baseline to third follow-up; “Yes” indicates statistically significant improvement (p-values less than 0.05), “Positive or Negative Trend” indicates some improvement (p-values between 0.05 and 0.10), and “No” indicates no evidence of improvement (p-values of 0.10 or larger).

³Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

CANS-CW Scores By County

- Sample sizes are smaller and can impair ability to detect differences.
- So on an individual County basis, many fewer areas of functional behavior show improvement over time.

Positive Youth Satisfaction During RBS

All-County Aggregate YSS Data

Subscale	Initial (n = 48)	Exit (n = 48)	Indication of Increase ¹
Satisfaction with Services	4.1 (0.7) ²	4.2 (0.7)	No
Child and Family Voice and Choice	4.0 (0.7)	4.1 (0.6)	No
Well-Being	4.1 (0.7)	4.2 (0.6)	No

¹This column refers to ranges of p-values for paired t-tests of the change from baseline to exit; “Yes” indicates statistically significant improvement (p-values less than 0.05), “Positive Trend” indicates some improvement (p-values between 0.05 and 0.10), and “No” indicates no evidence of improvement (p-values of 0.10 or larger).

²Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

Note: the “initial” YSS and YSS-F are administered at six months into the program – so this is actually a mid-range rating of RBS, and the caregivers are already seeing the benefits and appreciating RBS. The ratings for the Child and Family Voice and Choice scale actually function as one kind of a fidelity check on this key aspect of RBS. It is good to see these ratings positive at the 6 month mark, and remaining positive at RBS exit.

Positive Parent Satisfaction During RBS

All-County Aggregate YSS-F Data

Subscale	Initial (n = 33)	Exit (n = 33)	Indication of Increase ¹
Satisfaction with Services	4.4 (0.8) ²	4.5 (0.4)	No
Child and Family Voice and Choice	4.2 (0.8)	4.3 (0.6)	No
Well-Being	4.1 (0.8)	4.2 (0.5)	No

¹This column refers to ranges of p-values for paired t-tests of the change from baseline to exit; “Yes” indicates statistically significant improvement (p-values less than 0.05), “Positive Trend” indicates some improvement (p-values between 0.05 and 0.10), and “No” indicates no evidence of improvement (p-values of 0.10 or larger).

²Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

Note: the “initial” YSS and YSS-F are administered at six months into the program – so this is actually a mid-range rating of RBS, and the caregivers are already seeing the benefits and appreciating RBS. The ratings for the Child and Family Voice and Choice scale actually function as one kind of a fidelity check on this key aspect of RBS. It is good to see these ratings positive at the 6 month mark, and remaining positive at RBS exit.

Summary Exit Statistics

Performance Measure	Los Angeles	Sacramento	San Bernardino	San Francisco	Total
Number of clients served by RBS ^a	82	41	28	37	188
Number of RBS clients who exited RBS (client exits) ^b	61	26	20	18	125
Number of client exits to permanency	23 (37.7%)	12 (46.2%)	5 (25.0%)	4(22.2%)	44 (35.2%)
Average length of stay in all types of placement, in months, for client exits	13.6	14.6	9.7	10.0	12.7
Median length of stay in all types of placement, in months, for client exits (range in parentheses)	13.0 (<1.0-27.0)	17.0 (1.0-25.0)	8.0 (1.0-31.0)	6.0 (1.0-25.0)	12.0 (<1.0-27.0)
Number of exited clients who returned to group home care after being in a lower level of care	7	2	3	5	17

Summary Exit Statistics (cont.)

Performance Measure	Los Angeles	Sacramento	San Bernardino	San Francisco	Total
Number of exited clients who remained in a lower level of care	22	14	2	5	43
Number of exited clients who were reunified with their families at any time during RBS	24	16	8	5	53
Number (percentage) of exited clients reunified with their families who then returned to out-of-home care	3 (12.5%)	2 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	2 (40.0%)	8 (15.1%)
Number of exited clients with at least one substantiated maltreatment while at home or in group care during the RBS service delivery period	1	0	0	0	1
Median number of placements per client exit (range in parentheses)	2 (1-5)	2 (1-4)	1 (1-5)	2 (1-3)	2 (1-5)

^a These are the number of RBS youth served through March 2013 with assents/consents that are represented in the CWS/CMS data.

^b For purposes of this report, RBS youth are counted as exited if there is a valid RBS end date.

What can we conclude?

1. RBS outcome data look promising at this stage.
2. Outcomes from the CWS/CMS (e.g., achievement of permanency, length of stay) require time to pass, thus as more youth are served the data may become more stable.
3. CWS/CMS, CANS-CW, YSS, and YSS-F measures each provide key information to assess short-term and longer-term outcomes of RBS.
4. The CANS-CW should be completed as close to the RBS start date as possible.
5. Ideally, as group care reform is extended throughout CA and if it includes key RBS model components, the next cohort of state-wide youth served should be compared with the RBS youth cohort.

Connections between RBS Insights and CCR Values

RBS: “Family Involvement Changes Everything”

Consistent with CCR Core Principles

From family finding through, needs & strengths assessment, community supports, and intensive care coordination, the **family is involved at every step of the process toward permanency.**

RBS: “Communication, Coordination, and Trust”

CCR values teaming (Child, Youth & Family Team)

Brings together the child or youth and family with other significant team members to identify appropriate permanency options, helps the family develop and administer a plan of care that addresses their needs and strengths, and is mobile, allowing the team to follow the child or youth and family throughout their involvement with the child welfare system.

Connections between RBS Insights and CCR Values

RBS: “Permanency is a Process not an Event”

CCR Services Support Permanency

CCR focuses on reducing the length of stay indirectly by improving quality of care. **Intensive treatment and services for the child or youth and his/her family** ensure that not only is the child or youth receiving needed services, but the family or identified caregiver is prepared and supported after reunification, adoption or guardianship.

RBS: “Flexible Fiscal System”

Individual Case Rate Model

The new congregate care rate covers board and care and will be **based on the individual needs of the child or youth**, not the Rate Classification Level (RCL) of the provider. Other funding streams from county and federal sources allow more options and flexibility for community-based, and behavioral health services.



Connections between RBS Insights and CCR Values

RBS: “Leadership & Partnership are Essential”

Advancement of the CCR Model takes collaboration at every level

Implementation of the CCR recommendations will rely on a collaborative effort among state administrators, referring agencies, private providers, community partners, tribes, families and children and youth to achieve the vision of all children and youth living with a committed, nurturing and permanent family.

Discussion

- With the time remaining, we'd like to open the floor for discussion:
 - What do you think are the key implementation challenges facing the CCR effort at the state, county and provider levels as it moves ahead?
 - How do we get from where we are to where we want to be?

Conclusion

- Thank you for participating in this webinar
- For more information on RBS:
 - www.rbsreform.org
- For more information on CCR:
 - www.childsworld.ca.gov
- The complete report on lessons learned in RBS, titled: *Permanency, Partnership and Perseverance*, can be found on both of the above websites.